

## REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the above referenced application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kraus et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,266,684.

With regards to Claim 1, Claim 1 has been amended to recite the further limitation of colorizing any areas of images in a container that were not part of a previously recorded parent window, which clearly defines over Kraus, and a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Support for Applicant's amendment is disclosed on page 6, lines 4-6 of Applicant's specification. Applicant submits that Kraus fails to teach or suggest colorizing any areas in a container that were not part of a previously recorded parent window. Accordingly, Claim 1 is now believed to be allowable over the cited prior art, and favorable reconsideration of same is respectfully requested. Remaining dependent Claims 2-4, and 7 depend from independent Claim 1, and are thus also in condition of allowance.

With regards to Claim 8, Claim 8 has been amended to recite the further limitation of masking the container by colorizing any area of the image in the container that were not part of the previously recorded graphical image, clearly defining over Kraus, and a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Support for Applicant's amendment is disclosed on page 7, lines 7-9 of Applicant's specification. Applicant submits that Kraus fails to teach or suggest masking the container by colorizing any areas in the container that were not part of the previously recorded graphical image. Accordingly, Claim 8 is now believed to be allowable over the cited prior art, and favorable reconsideration of same is respectfully requested. Remaining dependent Claims 9-13, and 16-18 depend from independent Claim 8, and are thus also in condition of allowance.

With regards to Claim 19, Claim 19 has been amended to recite the limitation of dependent Claim 22, means for masking any areas of the images in the container that were not displayed at a specified period of time, clearly defining over Kraus. Support for Applicant's amendment is disclosed on page 7, lines 17-18 of Applicant's specification. Applicant submits

that Kraus fails to teach or suggest means for masking portions of the container that were not displayed at a specified period of time. Accordingly, Claim 19 is now believed to be allowable over the cited prior art, and favorable reconsideration of same is respectfully requested. Remaining dependent Claims 20 and 21 depend from independent Claim 19, and are thus also in condition of allowance.

With regard to Claims 14, 15, and 22, Claims 14, 15, and 22 have been canceled.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-4, 7-13, 16-21 are allowable over the cited prior art, and a notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

A Request for Continued Examination and a Petition to Revive Abandoned Application are enclosed along with the requisite fees. No additional fees are believed to be due, however, the Examiner is authorized to debit deposit account 10-0096 should any other fees be due.

If any other matters remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve these matters by Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert C. Klinger

Reg. No. 34,365

Attorney for Applicant

Jackson Walker L.L.P.  
901 Main Street, Suite 6000  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
(214) 953-5978  
(214) 661-6873 – Fax